



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

has reduced it occasionally to the level of a mere vocabulary or word-book. It is surprising, too, that he has chosen to pay no attention to the different shades of meaning in which one and the same term is employed by different New Testament writers.

But injustice would be done if the impression were given that the book is without merit. On the contrary, the skill of the experienced teacher can be discerned on many a page. The definitions are terse, clear, and sharply marked. The frequent joint employment of Latin and German in stating them is helpful, and the occasional references to Hebrew correspondents, and to examples from the Septuagint, are pertinent. The class of students for whom the work is primarily intended may explain why in the case of many debatable, and especially doctrinal, terms (for example, ἀπέχει, γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, ἐπερώτημα, ἐπιούσιος, ἱλαστήριον, λόγος, etc.) we are given diverse interpretations, or are referred to the "commentaries." The typography is distinct, handsome, and fairly accurate.

J. H. THAYER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass.

KRITISCH-EXEGETISCHER KOMMENTAR ÜBER DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Begründet von H. A. W. MEYER. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

ABTHEILUNG III. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Von der 5. Auflage neu bearbeitet von DR. HANS HINRICH WENDT. 8. Auflage, 1899. Pp. iv + 427. Bound, M. 7.50.

THE book of Acts is the New Testament writing in the study of which an opportunity is given to compare history of an uncertain date and authorship with contemporary documents; that is to say, a book in which the critical question is of more importance than interpretation. The contemporary documents are the epistles of Paul, and secondarily the Apocalypse, the synoptical gospels, and the epistle of James. What the traditionalists deny is not the opportunity for such comparison, but that the comparison presents a critical problem, a difficulty. This difficulty is the evident existence of a controversy between Paul and the Twelve, which appears in the documents, and the reduction of this to an inconsequential and polite difference in the history. The problem presented is admitted by Wendt in general terms, and due acknowledgment is made of the discovery of the problem by Baur. Wendt finds the source of the difficulty (1) in a

conscious warping of the facts by the author, making it to a certain extent a *Tendenz*-book ; (2) in the use of original sources by the author, which he edits. Wendt combines these two in a general way, maintaining that the author's general purpose was historical, with only a slight infusion of coloring matter, and that the main peculiarities of the book are due to the use of documents. The author, in his opinion, was a Hellenistic Jew, of about 95 A. D., and he warped or colored the facts, not in the interest of Judaism, nor of Paulinism, nor of a reconciling of the two, but under the unconscious influence of the undoctinal universalism of his own times.

More particularly, the most obvious of the documentary sources is that containing the part in which the author speaks in the first person. The critical assumption is that the author is not a contemporary; and therefore parts purporting to come from an associate of Paul, unless they are pure fabrications, must be from a contemporary document. Moreover, Wendt finds connection between these parts and the other parts of the Pauline history, indicating a common source, and then, further, between these and the history of the establishment of Gentile Christianity as a distinct thing. The author of this chief source is presumably Luke, as this accounts for the association of the whole book with him. The rose-colored picture of the early Jerusalem church which precedes this comes, the writer thinks, more probably from oral than written tradition. The discourses all of them, and the miracles some of them, are invented by the author himself to fit the different situations, after the manner of Thucydides.

There are several obvious criticisms of this view. (1) It does not account for the doctrinal verisimilitude of the discourses in the early chapters in Acts. These fit into the historical situation in the Jerusalem church, not after the manner of an invention, but of a historical writing. They represent just the lapse into Jewish Messianism which is evidently the doctrinal key to the situation. (2) It does not account for the discrepancy between the history and the contemporary documents, and especially between the history of Paul's work and the Pauline epistles. In the one, Paul is the apostle to the Gentiles exclusively; in the other, he preaches to the Jews first, and to the Gentiles only after his rejection by the Jews. Then, in the history, he is pursued by a Judaizing party in the Jewish church, but is sustained by the church as a whole, and by the apostles. In the epistles the authority that pursues him, far from being an inconsequential party in the church, without any sanction of its leaders, is such that even Peter

quails before it. All this ignorance or misrepresentation of the situation is explained, forsooth, by assuming a document covering the whole Pauline history, written by an associate of Paul. (3) This leaves Peter unaccounted for, as well as Paul. It makes him a reformer before Paul, makes the admission of the Gentiles to an equality with the Jews to be his work before the appearance of Paul, and makes Paul's admission into the apostleship to be based on this anticipation of his universalism by Peter. Whereas the epistles, which are the only trustworthy sources for this history, make Peter's change of ideas to be due to Paul. That is, he was started in this direction by Paul, but the synoptics prove that it was Jesus himself who showed the leader of the Twelve the way back to the truth.

E. P. GOULD.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER, I. 1—II. 17 : The Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary and Additional Notes. By the late F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. xvi + 188. \$1.25.

THAT was a very noteworthy literary compact into which the three scholars, then comparatively young, Lightfoot, Hort, and Westcott, entered in 1860, for the production of a commentary on the New Testament, and the outcome of it has greatly enriched biblical scholarship. The commentaries of Lightfoot on Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, besides the posthumous volume of notes on the other Pauline letters, and the works of Westcott on the gospel and epistles of John and the epistle to the Hebrews, are all books to be profoundly grateful for. Remembering the monumental work of Hort on the text of the New Testament, no one can wish that he had withheld that in order to carry out his part of the compact on the commentary. Yet every New Testament student can but wish that he could have done both this and that, and that wish will certainly be intensified by the study of this volume. It is, of course, only a fragment. In place of an introduction to the epistle, such as Dr. Hort would doubtless have given if he had lived to complete his work, we have only an introductory lecture, scarcely more than a sketch of an introduction. From it, however, we learn that Dr. Hort accepted the epistle as unquestionably genuine, dated it in Rome about the